DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 344 CE 007 480

AUTHOR	Alley, William E.
TITLE	Effect of Air Force Recruiting Incentives on Volunteer Enlistment.
INSTITUTION	Air Force Human Resources Lab., Lackland AFB, Tex. Personnel Research Div.
SPONS AGENCY	Air Force Human Resources Lab., Brooks AFB, Texas.
REPORT NO	AFHRL-TR-76-5
PUB DATE	May 76
NOTE	25p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Armed Forces; Career Opportunities; Comparative Analysis; *Enlisted Personnel; *Incentive Systems; Individual Needs; *Job Satisfaction; Motivation; *Occupational Aspiration; Organizational Climate; Perception; Rating Scales; *Recruitment; Work Attitudes; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS	*Air Force

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted to examine the manner in which various aspects of the Air Force are viewed by incoming recruits and to determine how these perceptions were related to volunteer enlistment decisions. Survey questionnaires were administered to basic trainees in FY 1971 (8,007) and FY 1972 (9,331). Respondents were asked to indicate their prior State of residence and whether they would enlist in the absence of the draft. They were also asked to rate a list of 15 job attributes related to the nature of work, work environment, and compensation according to their perceived importance and obtainability. By tabulating and cross- tabulating ratings on both dimensions, it was possible to characterize the career needs of the respondents and their perceptions of the Air Force as a means of fulfilling them. Regional variations in perceptions of the service were also analyzed. The results reveal differences in the way various reward outcomes were viewed by incoming recruits in terms of perceived importance and obtainability. In general, ratings of obtainability on a given attribute were much higher for volunteer enlistees than for the non-volunteers. The analysis is supplemented with tables. A list of references is included and a tabulation of regional variations is appended. (Author/EC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

JUL 01 1976 CE

AFHRL-TR-76-5

AIR FORCE

HUMAN RESOURCES

LABORATORY

ED126344

EFFECT OF AIR FORCE RECRUITING INCENTIVES ON VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENT

By

William E. Alley

PERSONNEL RESEARCH DIVISION
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236

May 1976
Final Report for Period 1 January 1970 – 30 December 1974

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE007480

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS 78235

NOTICE

When US Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This final report was submitted by Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236, under project 7719, with Hq Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC), Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235. William E. Alley, Personnel Research Division, was the project monitor.

This report has been reviewed and cleared for open publication and/or public release by the appropriate Office of Information (OI) in accordance with AFR 190-17 and DoDD 5230.9. There is no objection to unlimited distribution of this report to the public at large, or by DDC to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved.

LELAND D. BROKAW, Technical Director
Personnel Research Division

Approved for publication.

DAN D. FULGHAM, Colonel, USAF
Commander

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE *(When Data Entered)*

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER AFHRL-TR-76-5	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. / 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE *(and Subtitle)* EFFECT OF AIR FORCE RECRUITING INCENTIVES ON VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENT	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Technical Memorandum 1 January 1970 – 30 December 1974
	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) William E. Alley	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Personnel Research Division Air Force Human Resources Laboratory Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78235	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 62703F 77190228
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Hq Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC) Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235	12. REPORT DATE May 1976 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 24
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS*(if different from Controlling Office)*	15. SECURITY CLASS. *(of this report)* Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of this Report)*

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT *(of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)*

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS *(Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)*

incentives
irritants
volunteer force
attitudes
enlisted men
job satisfaction

20. ABSTRACT *(Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)*

Recent changes in U.S. selective service laws have brought the armed services into increasing competition with other large organizations to obtain sufficient numbers of qualified entry-level personnel. As a result, much greater emphasis has been placed on developing enlistment incentives to meet national and regional recruiting objectives. The purpose of this study was to examine the way various aspects of the Air Force are viewed by in-coming recruits and to determine how these perceptions were related to volunteer enlistment decisions. Attitude surveys were administered to two random samples of Air Force servicemen entering during FY 71 (N = 8,007) and FY 72 (N = 9,331). Respondents were asked to rate each of several aspects of the service (i.e., expected job interest, equitable pay, working conditions) according to its perceived importance and obtainability. They were also asked to

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE *(When Data Entered)*

Item 20 (Continued)

indicate (a) their state of residence prior to entry into service, and (b) the likelihood they would have enlisted in the absence of the draft. Responses to the survey were analyzed using multi-way distributions and correlational techniques. Comparisons were made between the two samples across time and within samples, between groups categorized according to volunteer intent. Finally, regional variations in perceptions of the service were investigated. Implications of findings for establishing recruiting incentives were discussed.

PREFACE

This work was conducted under Project 7719, Air Force Personnel System Development on Selection, Assignment, Evaluation, Quality Control, Retention, Promotion and Utilization; Task 771902, Research on Prediction and Assessment of Adaptability to Air Force Life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	5
II.	Method	5
III.	Results and Discussion	7
	Vocational Attitudes of Non-Prior Service Airmen	7
	Relationships between Factor Ratings and Volunteer Enlistment	10
	Factor Obtainability	11
	Regional Variations	12
IV.	Implications for Recruiting	15
V.	Conclusions	15
	References	16
	Appendix A: Regional Variations	17

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	List of Job Attributes	6
2	Definition of Rating Dimensions	6
3	Geographic Recruiting Regions	7
4	Frequency and Percentage Distribution for Survey Respondents by Sample, Recruiting Region, and Volunteer Enlistment Category	8
5	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the Importance/Obtainability Scale for Samples FY71 and FY72	9
6	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category (Sample FY 71)	10
7	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category (Sample FY 72)	11
8	Summary of Relationships Between Factor Obtainability and Volunteer Enlistment Category for Samples FY 71 and FY 72	12
9	Summary of Maginal Volunteer Responses to the I/O Scale by Recruiting Region (Sample FY72)	13
10	Summary of Correlational Relationships Between Factor Obtainability and Volunteer Enlistment Category by Recruiting Region and Sample	14
11	Summary of Factors Related to Enlistment Decisions	15
A1	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Northeast Enlistees (Sample FY 72)	18
A2	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Mid-Atlantic Enlistees (Sample FY 72)	18

List of Tables (*Continued*)

Table		Page
A3	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Southeast Enlistees (Sample FY 72)	19
A4	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Southwest Enlistees (Sample FY 72)	19
A5	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Cateogry – Great Lakes Enlistees (Sample FY 72)	20
A6	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Far West Enlistees (Sample FY 72)	20
A7	Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Midwest/Mtn Enlistees (Sample FY 72)	21

EFFECT OF AIR FORCE RECRUITING INCENTIVES ON VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent changes in DoD procurement policies have brought the Air Force into increasing competition with other large organizations in both the military and civilian job sector for qualified entry-level personnel. To compensate for the influence of the draft as a recruitment factor, Air Force managers have been searching for methods to strengthen the personnel procurement system. The need for research data is especially acute for the USAF Recruiting Service since this organization maintains overall responsibility for meeting national and regional manpower objectives.

Considerable research has been done in recent years to define potential problem areas in the system and to seek possible solutions (Cook, 1970; Cook & White, 1970; Gates Commission Report, 1970; Hause & Fisher, 1968; Saber Volunteer, 1971; Vitola & Brokaw, 1973; Vitola & Valentine, 1971). Findings from these early studies, some of which have been recently corroborated in an analysis of all-volunteer accessions (Vitola, Mullins & Brokaw, 1974), indicated that prior to 1973, the draft was exerting considerable influence on the number and composition of enlisted accessions to the Air Force. There was further indication that enlistees entering service under draft-pressure were better qualified than true volunteer enlistees.

In a related area, it was noted that regardless of the problems associated with meeting national objectives, certain areas of the country seemed to be more viable sources of volunteer enlistees than did others (Alley, 1971). Recent evidence from the field has tended to confirm expectations that considerable more difficulty would be encountered in the Northeast, Great Lakes and Midwest/Mountain regions than in other areas of the country (USAF Recruiting Service, 1973). In consideration of the declining availability of manpower, various plans and programs have been formulated. Among these have been attempts to enlarge and revitalize the military advertising and publicity operation and to increase the effectiveness of individual recruiters in the field (Commanders Digest, 1972; Proceedings on the All-Volunteer Force, 1972). In moving toward these goals, however, management and recruiting personnel require a more definitive analysis of the enlistment decision and the motivational factors which underlie it.

Mullins, Massey, and Riederich (1970) addressed this problem in an early study of reasons given for Air Force enlistment. A large percentage of airmen surveyed in the study cited educational opportunities, wide choice of assignments, and travel as being most influential in their decision to enlist. Guinn and Truax (1973) approached the problem along somewhat different lines but replicated many of the findings. The later report also made note of several negative factors (such as perceived loss of personal control) which might detract from effective recruiting efforts.

The purpose of the present study is to provide additional insight into the question of why airmen enlist – with particular emphasis on identifying characteristics of the service which might be used as a basis for improved recruiting strategies. Empirical data was gathered to characterize the vocational attitudes of enlisted personnel who have recently entered the service. The views of recent enlistees toward the military are important to recruiters because they are based in large part on prior contact with a variety of information sources (i.e., news media, recruiters, high school counselors) rather than on any direct experience. The study was specifically designed to answer two basic questions about various reward outcomes in the service (i.e., pay, job interest, promotions, etc.): (a) how are they viewed by representative recruits in terms of importance and perceived obtainability, and (b) to what extent are these perceptions related to volunteer enlistment. As a secondary objective, an effort was made to highlight attitude variations, if any, between enlistees entering from each of the seven USAF recruiting areas. These data would be useful in identifying recruiting appeals that might be more appropriate for certain regions than for others. Finally, surveys were conducted during two consectuive time periods to permit assessments over time.

II. METHOD

Survey questionnaires were administered to basic trainees at Lackland AFB, Texas from May 1970 through December 1970 (N_1 = 8,007) and again from July 1971 through June 1972 (N_2 = 9,331). The

samples are referred to as FY 71 and FY 72, respectively, in the results and discussion. After a brief background section in which respondents were asked to indicate (a) state of residence prior to entry, and (b) the likelihood they would have enlisted in the absence of the draft, they were presented with a list of job attributes as shown in Table 1. The instructions were to rate each item on a 5-point scale according to its overall importance or worth on a job. Scale values ranged from "little or no" importance to "high" importance. Respondents were then asked to rate the same items in reverse order according to their perceived obtainability in the Air Force, again using a 5-point scale ranging from little or no possibility of attainment to high possibility. By tabulating and cross-tabulating ratings on both dimensions, it was possible to characterize the career needs of the respondents in a number of areas and their perceptions of the Air Force as a means of fulfilling them.

Table 1. **List of Job Attributes**

Job Attribute	Abbreviated Title
Nature of Work	
1 Be assigned to an interesting job	Job Interest
2 Do a job which is equal to my abilities	Utilization of Talent
3 Be given important responsibilities	Responsibility
Work Environment	
1 Do your job under good working conditions	Work Conditions
2 Work with friendly and cooperative people	Friendly Coworkers
3 Have supervisors who know what they are talking about	Competent Supervision
4 Have a say in what happens to you	Personal Control
5 Have good job security	Security
6 Have enough time off from the job	Leisure
7 Have prestige and social status	Prestige
Compensation	
1 Receive fair payment for the type of work you are doing	Fair Salary
2 Gain technical training and experience	Technical Training
3 Be promoted quickly	Rapid Promotions
4 Be given recognition for work well done	Recognition
5 Do a great deal of traveling	Travel

For simplicity of presentation, each airman's responses to the individual attributes were grouped into high and low categories and combined into four response classes as shown in Table 2. Percentages were then obtained by combining various classes of response so that the importance, obtainability, satisfaction, and dissatisfaction associated with each factor could be determined.

Table 2. **Definition of Rating Dimensions**

Importance Rating	Code	Obtainability Rating	Code
Extremely Important	(High)	Very Good Possibility	(High)
Above Average Importance	(High)	Better than Average Possibility	(High)
Average Importance	(Low)	Average Possibility	(Low)
Below Average Importance	(Low)	Less than Average Possibility	(Low)
Not Important at All	(Low)	No Possibility at All	(Low)

Importance - was operationally defined as the proportion of the sample indicating that an attribute was "above average" or "extremely important."

Obtainability - was measured by the proportion who rated factor obtainability as being "above average" or "very good."

Satisfaction - was indicated by the percentage rating an item both "highly important" and "highly obtainable."

Dissatisfaction - reflected ratings of "high importance" but relatively "low obtainability" in the service.

State of residence prior to enlistment was used as a basis for assigning enlistees to one of the seven geographic regions as defined by USAF Recruiting Service (1971) (Table 3). Responses to the volunteer enlistment question were grouped into volunteer (definitely or probably would), marginal (undecided), and non-volunteer (definitely or probably would not) categories. Results are summarized using multi-way distributions (frequency and percent), and correlational techniques. Tests of statistical significance were conducted by way of chi-square analysis.

Table 3. **Geographic Recruiting Regions**

Region	State of Residence
R1	Northeast – Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont
R2	Mid-Atlantic – Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia (59%)
R3	Southeast – Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia
R4	Southwest – Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas
R5	Great Lakes – Illinois (75%), Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia (41%)
R6	Far West – Alaska, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington
R7	Midwest/Mountain – Colorado, Illinois (25%), Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Kansas

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 4 shows frequency and percentage distributions of the samples by recruiting region and volunteer enlistment category. Also shown in the table for reference purposes are the accountable population estimates for each region which serve as a basis for establishing regional objectives.

It is interesting to note that the current problem areas, as indicated by the Recruiting Service, show up in these data as having proportionally fewer volunteers than would be expected on the basis of population resources. The Mid-Atlantic region, for example, which contains roughly 15 percent of the accountable population, supplies only 11 percent of the total volunteers to both samples. The Far West, by contrast, supplied 19 percent of the volunteer enlistments from a population base representing 14 percent of the total. Also noteworthy is the fact that the overall proportion of volunteers within each sample increased from 52 to 66 percent in the time period covered by the study thus reflecting a trend toward decreasing reliance on the draft and increasing reliance on true volunteer enlistments.

Vocational Attitudes of Non-Prior Service Airmen

Overall response percentages to the job-attitude questionnaire are summarized in Table 5 for both samples. Enlistees entering during FY 71 placed greatest emphasis on receiving competent supervision (96%). The supervisory factor was followed in overall importance by *job interest, friendly co-workers,* opportunities for *technical training,* and *security.* Attributes considered least important by relatively large

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Survey Respondents by Sample, Recruiting Region, and Volunteer Enlistment Category

Recruiting Region	Accountable Population[a]		Sample FY 71								Sample FY 72							
			Volunteer		Undecided		Non-Volunteer		Total		Volunteer		Undecided		Non-Volunteer		Total	
	N (in millions)	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
01 Northeast	28.24	14.1	564	13.4	201	13.0	295	13.3	1,060	13.3	638	10.4	193	12.3	193	12.4	1,026	11.1
02 Mid-Atlantic	29.48	14.8	479	11.4	185	12.0	222	10.0	886	11.2	677	11.0	190	12.1	183	11.7	1,050	11.3
03 Southeast	28.83	14.4	648	15.4	228	14.7	299	13.5	1,175	14.7	1,047	17.0	242	15.5	207	13.3	1,496	16.1
04 Southwest	22.09	11.1	595	14.1	193	12.5	307	13.8	1,095	13.7	916	14.9	229	14.6	193	12.4	1,338	14.4
05 Great Lakes	35.95	18.0	618	14.7	274	17.7	404	18.2	1,296	16.2	972	15.8	220	14.1	267	17.1	1,459	15.7
06 Far West	28.98	14.5	815	19.4	276	17.9	328	14.8	1,419	17.9	1,154	18.7	301	19.2	282	18.1	1,737	18.7
07 Midwest/Mtn	26.03	13.0	488	11.6	188	12.2	362	16.3	1,038	13.0	753	12.2	189	12.1	234	15.0	1,176	12.7
Total Valid	199.59	100.0	4,207	100.0	1,545	100.0	2,217	100.0	7,983	100.0	6,157	100.0	1,564	100.0	1,559	100.0	9,280	100.0
Other			24		6		8		38		35		8		8		51	
Total	199.59		4,231		1,551		2,225		8,007		6,192		1,572		1,567		9,331[b]	

[a]Based on 1970 census information obtained from USAF Recruiting Service.

[b]Excludes two cases w/volunteer status unknown.

Table 5. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the Importance/ Obtainability Scale for Samples FY71 and FY72**

Job Attribute	High Importance		High Obtainability		Satisfaction		Dissatisfaction	
	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72
Nature of Work								
1 Job Interest	92	89	57	57	53	49	39	38
2 Utilization of Talent	91	86	68	69	63	62	28	25
3 Responsibility	53	51	61	64	39	39	14	13
Work Environment								
1 Working Conditions	86	85	70	67	63	60	23	25
2 Friendly Co-workers	92	90	65	62	52	58	30	32
3 Competent Supervision	96	92	84	83	82	78	14	14
4 Personal Control	89	88	31	25	30	23	59	65
5 Security	90	93	75	82	70	78	20	15
6 Leisure	65	53	42	47	29	27	36	26
7 Prestige	41	37	37	35	24	21	17	16
Compensation								
1 Fair Salary	87	87	47	52	43	47	44	40
2 Technical Training	92	91	87	89	83	83	9	8
3 Rapid Promotions	59	52	32	35	23	22	36	30
4 Recognition	82	74	51	48	46	39	36	34
5 Travel	29	26	58	64	22	20	7	6

numbers of respondents included opportunities for *travel, prestige,* and *responsibility*. The obtainability ratings indicate that *technical training* and *competent supervision* were regarded as most obtainable in the service while *personal control, rapid advancement,* and *prestige* were considered least obtainable among the attributes.

The combined importance/obtainability (satisfaction) ratings show that opportunities for *technical training, competent supervision,* and *security* were the most satisfying characteristics associated with the Air Force. On the other hand, nearly 60 percent of the FY 71 sample felt that the lack of *personal control* was the greatest potential source of dissatisfaction. After personal control, dissatisfaction was indicated with the dim prospects of obtaining an equitable *salary* and of being assigned to an *interesting job* in the Air Force. Other dissatisfying characteristics of the service mentioned frequently included possible lack of *recognition* for work well done, slow *advancement* opportunities, and inadequate *leisure* time.

A comparison of attitudes across time reveals much the same pattern. The most noteworthy shifts between FY 71 and FY 72 occurred in the importance and obtainability ratings. The percentage of enlistees for example who rated *leisure* as highly important decreased from 65 to 53 percent. Indeed, there was a trend toward decreasing importance across all of the factors over time. Aside from leisure, the largest net decreases were noted in the importance of *recognition,* rapid *promotions,* and *utilization of talent.* The only exception occurred with the *security* factor where the proportion of high-importance ratings increased over time by three percent.

The obtainability ratings of four of the 15 factors were also time dependent. These, of course, could be indications of actual or perceived changes in the Air Force during the intervening time between samplings. Positive gains in perceived obtainability were noted for the *security, travel,* and *salary* attributes indicating more favorable viewpoints in the later survey. The obtainability of *personal control,* however, decreased in the same time-period by seven percentage points. Corresponding differences across time were also noted in the satisfaction/dissatisisfaction ratings.

Relationships between Factor Ratings and Volunteer Enlistment

Distributions of sample responses by volunteer intent category are presented in Tables 6 and 7. These data are particularly relevant for recruiting purposes since differences noted between volunteers and non-volunteers may offer insight into which of the factors are most related to voluntary enlistment. If perceptions of the Air Force do not differ across this dimension, then it would be unlikely that changes in these perceptions as a function of recruiting would have any noticeable effect on decisions to enter service. At the same time, useful impressions may be gained from the responses of marginal volunteers; a likely target population for additional recruiting efforts.

In the most recent survey (Table 6), only minor differences were noted in the rated importance of the factors between the three volunteer intent groups. There was a slight tendency for volunteers to value *responsibility, technical training, travel,* and *security* more highly and to place less emphasis on the importance of adequate *leisure* time. Relatively large between-group differences were noted, however, in rated factor obtainability. Volunteers were much more likely to view Air Force jobs as being more interesting, as more likely to utilize their talents, and as better paying than were non-volunteers. Obtainability ratings between groups differed least for *travel,* adequate *working conditions, personal control,* and *leisure* indicating that volunteers and non-volunteers alike have very similar perceptions about the possibility of obtaining these rewards.

Table 6. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category (Sample FY 71)**

	High Importance			High Obtainability			Satisfaction			Dissatisfaction		
Job Attribute	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %
Nature of Work												
1 Job Interest	91	92	94	65	56	43	60	52	53	31	40	41
2 Utilization of Talent	91	92	92	74	66	55	70	63	51	21	29	41
3 Responsibility	55	50	50	66	59	54	43	36	32	12	14	18
Work Environment												
1 Working Conditions	85	86	87	75	69	62	67	62	56	18	24	31
2 Friendly Co-workers	92	92	94	71	64	56	67	60	53	25	32	41
3 Competent Supervision	96	96	95	89	83	76	86	81	73	10	15	22
4 Personal Control	88	90	91	37	31	22	35	30	20	53	60	71
5 Security	91	90	89	79	75	68	74	69	62	17	21	27
6 Leisure	60	65	75	46	40	35	30	29	28	30	36	47
7 Prestige	43	43	38	43	37	27	28	25	17	15	18	21
Compensation												
1 Fair Salary	87	88	87	54	46	32	50	43	29	37	45	58
2 Tech Training	94	92	86	89	88	82	87	83	74	7	9	12
3 Rapid Promotions	57	58	63	37	29	23	26	21	18	31	37	45
4 Recognition	82	82	85	57	48	43	51	44	39	31	38	46
5 Travel	35	27	23	59	53	58	27	19	16	8	8	7

Table 7. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category (Sample FY 72)**

Job Attribute	High Importance			High Obtainability			Satisfaction			Dissatisfaction		
	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %
Nature of Work												
1 Job Interest	89	87	90	61	52	44	55	46	40	34	41	50
2 Utilization of Talent	87	84	86	73	65	57	65	56	52	21	28	34
3 Responsibility	53	50	44	68	61	54	42	31	30	12	14	15
Work Environment												
1 Working Conditions	85	85	86	69	65	61	62	58	54	23	27	32
2 Friendly Co-workers	90	89	90	66	58	54	60	54	50	29	36	40
3 Competent Supervision	92	90	91	85	84	76	80	76	71	12	14	20
4 Personal Control	88	87	89	26	26	21	24	23	19	64	64	70
5 Security	94	92	91	85	79	74	81	74	69	13	18	23
6 Leisure	51	56	59	48	44	40	28	27	24	23	29	35
7 Prestige	37	37	33	38	34	26	22	20	15	15	17	18
Compensation												
1 Fair Salary	88	88	88	55	50	41	51	45	37	38	43	50
2 Tech Training	93	90	86	91	88	82	85	81	73	08	08	12
3 Rapid Promotions	51	50	49	38	32	26	24	18	16	28	32	33
4 Recognition	73	75	75	51	45	40	42	37	34	31	38	42
5 Travel	28	25	22	66	61	61	22	18	15	06	07	07

Factor Obtainability

From a practical standpoint the importance and obtainability ratings are not of equal concern. In designing recruiting appeals which seek to create a more favorable view of the service, it is often assumed that the subjective importance associated with various job factors is less amenable to change than are perceptions of what job as a means of achieving desirable outcomes. With this view in mind, the relationships between factor obtainability and volunteer enlistment were explored in greater detail. Table 8 shows the obtainability ratings from both samples as a function of volunteer enlistment category. Also shown are numerical indices of these relationships in the form of phi coefficients. These values have a theoretical range of −1.0 to +1.0 where a zero would indicate no difference between volunteer groups. Most of the tabled values range from 0 to +.21. In the earlier sample, the strength of these relationships was generally higher than in the later sample. Only in the case of the travel factor were non-significant differences noted in the FY 71 sample ($p > .01$). In the second sample, four of the 15 factors failed to reach statistical significance: *working conditions, personal control, leisure,* and *travel.*

By far the most distinguishing characteristic of the volunteer enlistee as compared with the non-volunteer is the extent to which he views the service as an opportunity for obtaining interesting and challenging work. This was evidenced by the response differentials to both the *job interest* and *utilization* of *talent* items. In both cases, volunteers were much more likely to evaluate these factors as high in obtainability as compared with non-volunteers. Another important correlate of volunteer enlistment appears to be equitable *salary.* In the early sample, 54 percent of the volunteers rated this factor highly obtainable versus 34 percent of the non-volunteers. In the later sample, these differences were smaller (55% versus 51%) but still significant.

Table 8. **Summary of Relationships Between Factor Obtainability and Volunteer Enlistment Category for Samples FY 71 and FY 72**

Job Attribute	Obtainability Ratings							
	Enlistment Category FY71				Enlistment Category FY72			
	Vol	Undec	N-Vol	Phi[a]	Vol	Undec	N-Vol	Phi[a]
Nature of Work								
1 Job Interest	65	56	43	.21	61	52	44	.14
2 Utilization of Talent	74	66	55	.19	73	65	57	.14
3 Responsibility	66	59	54	.12	68	61	54	.12
Work Environment								
1 Working Conditions	75	69	62	.14	69	65	61	.07[ns]
2 Friendly Co-workers	71	64	56	.15	66	58	54	.10
3 Competent Supervision	89	83	76	.17	85	84	76	.10
4 Personal Control	37	31	22	.15	26	26	21	.05[ns]
5 Security	79	75	68	.12	85	79	74	.12
6 Leisure	46	40	35	.11	48	44	40	.06[ns]
7 Prestige	43	37	27	.16	38	34	26	.10
Compensation								
1 Fair Salary	54	46	32	.21	55	50	41	.12
2 Tech Training	89	88	82	.10	91	88	82	.12
3 Rapid Promotions	37	29	23	.14	38	32	26	.10
4 Recognition	57	48	43	.13	51	45	40	.09
5 Travel	59	53	58	.01[ns]	66	61	61	.04[ns]

[a]Phi coefficients are statistically significant ($p < .01$) unless otherwise indicated.
[ns]Non-significant.

Regional Variations

To determine if there were regional differences in either gross response levels to the importance-obtainability items or in the relationships between rated obtainability and volunteer enlistment, the information collected in the survey was analyzed separately for each of the seven USAF recruiting regions. Since ratings might be influenced by the different proportion of volunteers within each region, the volunteer/non-volunteer distinction was maintained to avoid this bias insofar as possible. The complete tabulations for the most recent sample (FY 72) are shown in Appendix A (Tables A1 through A7). For discussion purposes, the responses of the marginal volunteers have been summarized in Table 9. In general, there were few differences between areas in the rated importance of the job factors. Marginal volunteers differed significantly on two of the 15 factors: *prestige* and *rapid promotions* (X^2 sig $< .01$). Respondents from the Southeast and Southwest typically rated the importance of *prestige* and *rapid promotions* higher than did corresponding groups from the other regions. In the obtainability ratings, there were significant area differences (X^2 sig $< .01$) on five of the fifteen factors: *utilization of talent, working conditions, co-workers, competent supervision,* and *salary*. As a general rule, enlistees from the South believed that these job attributes were more obtainable in the service than did marginal volunteers from the other regions, particularly those from the Great Lakes and Far West.

The extent to which obtainability ratings corresponded to volunteer enlistment also differed across regions, although, again, differences were somewhat small and time dependent. The summary data shown in Table 10 indicates that, as with the nationwide comparisons, *job interest, utilization of talent,* and *salary* have the most consistent relationship with enlistments across all areas. In specific regions, however, some of the factors operated with greater or lesser intensity than might be expected from the nationwide trends. In the Northeast, the availability of *friendly co-workers* seemed to distinguish volunteers from non-volunteers to a greater degree than in other regions. Similarly, *prestige* had a more apparent influence on enlistees from the Southeast and Southwest regions.

Table 9. Summary of Marginal Volunteer Responses to the I/O Scale by Recruiting Region[a] (Sample FY72)

Job Attribute	High Importance							High Obtainability							Satisfaction							Dissatisfaction						
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7
Nature of Work																												
1 Job Interest	93	88	88	89	87	90	86	51	52	55	59	47	50	52	43	46	50	54	40	45	45	40	42	38	34	46	45	41
2 Utilization of Talent	81	87	83	87	85	86	80	66	66	73	69	55	62	65*	55	58	63	62	48	53	56	26	29	20	25	37	33	24
3 Responsibility	45	49	56	54	45	53	43	66	56	60	59	59	62	65	31	34	40	38	30	39	34	14	14	17	16	15	14	9
Work Environment																												
1 Working Conditions	88	85	85	85	82	85	81	67	71	64	72	62	56	65*	62	64	60	61	55	50	58	26	21	25	23	27	35	23
2 Friendly Co-workers	90	88	91	93	86	88	91	56	58	65	63	59	47	62*	52	55	61	61	52	42	58	37	34	30	32	34	45	33
3 Competent Supervision	92	93	92	90	84	90	94	83	86	90	85	83	76	83*	76	82	82	77	72	69	79	16	11	10	13	12	21	14
4 Personal Control	90	89	88	85	86	85	88	22	29	29	33	24	23	24	19	28	26	28	22	19	23	70	62	62	57	64	66	66
5 Security	83	95	91	92	91	92	88	81	77	75	80	79	80	83	76	74	69	75	74	75	76	17	21	21	17	18	17	12
6 Leisure	63	52	57	55	54	59	53	42	42	42	52	42	47	46	27	24	26	30	24	32	26	36	58	31	25	30	27	26
7 Prestige	38	37	45	43	35	30	34*	35	39	37	37	30	27	34	19	24	24	23	20	16	18	19	13	21	20	15	14	16
Compensation																												
1 Fair Salary	89	85	92	91	85	89	88	42	53	52	57	40	45	50*	44	44	50	53	37	42	46	45	31	42	38	47	43	43
2 Tech Training	89	92	92	91	87	91	87	88	86	91	90	82	88	89	80	80	86	84	77	81	79	8	12	6	7	10	9	7
3 Rapid Promotions	46	52	56	61	45	48	46*	31	35	29	42	31	29	31	13	21	19	28	14	15	17	33	31	37	33	31	32	29
4 Recognition	75	79	74	79	71	71	77	46	49	45	50	38	42	44	36	41	39	44	30	34	37	39	38	35	35	41	38	40
5 Travel	23	25	26	30	21	25	20	63	61	56	64	61	61	61	15	20	18	24	14	20	14	8	6	9	6	7	5	6

Note. — Since both satisfaction and dissatisfaction were partially dependent on the previous two ratings, no statistical tests were performed on these measures.

[a]R1 – Northeast
R2 – Mid-Atlantic
R3 – Southeast
R4 – Southwest
R5 – Great Lakes
R6 – Far West
R7 – Midwest/Mountain

*Indicates χ^2 significant < .01.

Table 10. **Summary of Correlational Relationships Between Factor Obtainability and Volunteer Enlistment Category by Recruiting Region and Sample**

Job Attribute	Northeast		Mid-Atlantic		Southeast		Southwest		Great Lakes		Far West		Midwest Mountain		All Regions Combined	
	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72	FY71	FY72
Nature of Work																
1 Job Interest	.18	.19	.30	.09	.19	.13	.17	.15	.24	.10	.16	.17	.25	.18	.21	.14
2 Utilization of Talent	.22	.13	.30	.11	.15	.10	.16	.15	.22	.12	.14	.14	.18	.19	.19	.14
3 Responsibility	.12	.12	.14	.08	.11	–	.13	.18	.16	.14	.13	.13	.11	.11	.12	.12
Work Environment																
1 Working Conditions	.09	–	.09	–	.10	–	–	.11	.17	–	.14	.11	.16	–	.14	.07
2 Friendly Co-workers	.16	.15	.21	–	.18	–	.12	.10	.17	.13	.12	.11	.13	–	.13	.10
3 Competent Supervision	.20	–	.19	–	.15	–	.15	.15	.20	.11	.14	.12	.17	.09	.17	.10
4 Personal Control	.17	–	.22	.09	.13	.10	.18	–	.14	–	–	–	.15	–	.15	.05
5 Security	.13	–	.15	–	.13	–	.11	.11	.13	.20	–	.15	.12	.12	.12	.12
6 Leisure	.10	–	.18	–	.09	–	–	.14	.13	–	–	–	.10	–	.11	.06
7 Prestige	.16	.09	.19	–	.19	–	.16	.14	.18	.14	.11	.09	–	–	.16	.10
Compensation																
1 Fair Salary	.24	.09	.33	.09	.20	.10	.19	.12	.21	.15	.17	.13	.19	.09	.21	.11
2 Tech Training	.17	–	.15	.09	.13	–	–	.17	.16	–	.09	.14	.10	.15	.10	.12
3 Rapid Promotions	.19	–	.16	.09	.13	–	.11	.13	.13	–	.10	.11	.15	.12	.14	.10
4 Recognition	.16	.09	.18	–	.15	.09	–	.13	.15	–	.13	.09	–	.09	.13	.09
5 Travel	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	.09	–	–	–	–	–	–	.01	.04

Note. – Dash denotes non-significant correlation ($p > .01$)

IV. IMPLICATIONS FOR RECRUITING

A number of job attributes have been considered in terms of their relative importance and obtainability as perceived by recruits categorized according to probability of volunteer enlistment. In selecting the most effective appeals, it might be assumed a priori that those features of the job perceived as high in importance and high in obtainability (satisfier) would be likely candidates as would those items considered high in importance and low in obtainability (dissatisfier). A feature of the Air Force that appears dissatisfying to potential recruits may serve as a basis for an effective recruiting appeal if, in fact, it is based on some misconception about service life. At the same time, it would also be desirable if the selected attributes had some demonstrable relationship with volunteer enlistment as evidenced by differential perceptions as a function of enlistment category. That is, if volunteers as a group do not view a particular factor any differently than do non-volunteers, then it is unlikely that any mediated change in the perceived obtainability of the attribute as a function of recruiting would increase the likelihood of enlistment. Table 11 summarizes factors rated high on either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Also shown is the estimated effect on enlistment decisions as a function of rated obtainability. There are several attributes which seem to meet both criteria: *utilization of talent, fair salary*, and *job interest*. Equally prominent but showing little or no relationship with volunteer enlistment were *technical training, security, competent supervision*, and *working conditions* among the satisfiers and *personal control, recognition*, and *friendly co-workers* among the dissatisfiers. In this same manner, regional profiles could be developed where data indicated significant differences with the nationwide sample.

Table 11. **Summary of Factors Related to Enlistment Decisions[a]**

Satisfier (Important and Obtainable)		Dissatisfier (Important and Unobtainable)	
Factor	Significant Effect on Enlistment[b]	Factor	Significant Effect on Enlistment
Technical Training	Yes	Personal Control	No
Competent Supervision	Yes	Fair Salary	Yes
Security	Yes	Job Interest	Yes
Working Conditions	No	Recognition	Yes
Utilization of Talent	Yes	Friendly Co-workers	Yes

[a]Based on responses of marginal volunteers (Sample T2).

[b]Based on correlational relationships between factor obtainability and volunteer enlistment.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Results from this study indicate that there are differences in the way various reward outcomes are viewed by incoming recruits in terms of both perceived importance and obtainability. For specific factors, differences in these dimensions were also found to be related to volunteer enlistment category, particularly with respect to the obtainability ratings. In general, ratings of obtainability on a given factor were much higher for volunteer enlistees than for the marginal or non-volunteers. Regional differences were noted in both the absolute level of the ratings and the degree to which the ratings were related to volunteer enlistment although these effects were moderate and tended to vary somewhat over time.

It is recommended on the basis of these findings that future recruiting efforts deemphasize certain aspects of the service which are viewed as either relatively unimportant or which do not correlate with volunteer enlistment (i.e., *travel, responsibility, leisure, prestige*, and *rapid promotions*) in favor of such characteristics as *interesting jobs, utilization of talents*, and *equitable salary*.

REFERENCES

Alley, W.E. *Recruiting an all volunteer Air Force.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September 1971.

Commander's Digest. Special Issue: *All-volunteer force.* Vol 12, No. 19. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, September 1972.

Cook, A.A., Jr. *The supply of Air Force volunteers.* RM-6361-PR. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation, September 1970.

Cook, A.A., Jr., & White, J.P. *Estimating the quality of Air Force volunteers* RM-6360-PR. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation, September 1970.

Gates, T.S. (Chairman). *The report of the President's commission on an all-volunteer armed force.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1970.

Guinn, N., & Truax, S.R. *Comparison of volunteer attitudes and career motivation among officer and airman personnel.* AFHRL-TR-73-28, AD-772 676. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, October 1973.

Hause, J.C., & Fisher, A.C. *The supply of first-term enlisted manpower in the absence of a draft.* Study S-293, AD-691 185, IDA Log No. Hq 67-6911. Arlington, VA: Institute for Defense Analyses, April 1968.

Mullins, C.J., Massey, I.H., & Riederich, L.D. *Why airmen enlist.* AFHRL-TR-70-29, AD-714 551. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, August 1970.

Proceedings of conference on the all-volunteer force. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Air Force and the Manpower Institute, May 1972.

Saber Volunteer. *An analysis of problems associated with the establishment of an all-volunteer force for the United States.* Washington, D.C.: USAF Assistant Chief of Staff, Studies and Analysis, Hq USAF, December 1971.

USAF Recruiting Service. *Mission progress report for 1st quarter FY 1972.* Randolph AFB, TX: September 1971.

USAF Recruiting Service *Production report (cumulative) for 1 July 1973 – 31 October 1973.* Randolph AFB, TX: October 1973.

Vitola, B.M., & Brokaw, L.D. *Comparison of 1970 and 1971 Air Force enlistees by draft-vulnerability category.* AFHRL-TR-72-49, AD-760 537. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, March 1973.

Vitola, B.M., Mullins, C.J., & Brokaw, L.D. *Quality of the all-volunteer force – 1973.* AFHRL-TR-74-35, AD-781 755. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, April 1974.

Vitola, B.M., & Valentine, L.D., Jr. *Assessment of Air Force accessions by draft vulnerability category.* AFHRL-TR-71-10, AD-724 094. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, March 1971.

APPENDIX A: REGIONAL VARIATIONS

Table A1. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Northeast Enlistees (Sample FY 72)**

Job Attribute	High Importance			High Obtainability			Satisfaction			Dissatisfaction		
	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %
Nature of Work												
1 Job Interest	88	83	90	57	51	35	52	43	32	36	40	58
2 Utilization of Talent	86	81	84	69	66	54	61	55	48	25	26	36
3 Responsibility	51	45	42	68	66	54	41	31	31	10	14	11
Work Environment												
1 Working Conditions	85	88	89	69	67	60	61	62	55	24	26	34
2 Friendly Co-workers	89	90	93	64	56	47	59	52	46	30	37	47
3 Competent Supervision	91	92	90	84	83	79	77	76	72	13	16	18
4 Personal Control	89	90	91	25	22	22	22	19	20	67	70	71
5 Security	92	93	89	82	81	76	78	76	68	14	17	21
6 Leisure	46	63	54	47	42	38	24	27	21	22	36	33
7 Prestige	38	38	31	36	35	26	21	19	15	17	19	16
Compensation												
1 Fair Salary	85	89	88	54	42	44	49	44	40	36	45	48
2 Tech Training	91	89	84	88	88	82	82	80	72	10	8	13
3 Rapid Promotions	46	46	40	32	31	26	19	13	17	27	33	23
4 Recognition	69	75	69	46	46	36	37	36	27	32	39	41
5 Travel	26	23	21	62	63	56	19	15	13	7	8	8

Table A2. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Mid-Atlantic Enlistees (Sample FY 72)**

Job Attribute	High Importance			High Obtainability			Satisfaction			Dissatisfaction		
	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %
Nature of Work												
1 Job Interest	90	88	91	63	52	55	57	46	51	32	42	40
2 Utilization of Talent	88	84	83	74	66	62	66	58	54	22	29	29
3 Responsibility	52	49	44	67	56	57	39	34	31	14	14	14
Work Environment												
1 Working Conditions	86	85	85	71	71	64	64	64	57	22	21	28
2 Friendly Co-workers	89	88	89	67	58	58	61	55	54	28	34	35
3 Competent Supervision	92	93	92	85	86	80	80	82	77	12	11	15
4 Personal Control	86	89	89	26	29	17	25	28	15	62	62	73
5 Security	93	95	93	85	77	78	81	74	75	12	21	18
6 Leisure	48	52	56	46	42	43	26	24	26	22	28	30
7 Prestige	39	37	32	39	39	31	21	24	17	18	13	15
Compensation												
1 Fair Salary	86	85	89	55	53	44	50	44	42	36	31	46
2 Tech Training	92	92	86	91	86	84	85	80	74	7	12	11
3 Rapid Promotions	53	52	48	39	35	28	24	21	15	29	31	33
4 Recognition	74	79	78	54	49	46	44	41	40	29	38	38
5 Travel	27	25	20	67	61	64	22	20	14	4	6	7

Table A3. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Southeast Enlistees (Sample FY 72)**

Job Attribute	High Importance			High Obtainability			Satisfaction			Dissatisfaction		
	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %
Nature of Work												
1 Job Interest	88	88	88	62	55	45	54	50	41	33	38	47
2 Utilization of Talent	88	83	86	76	73	64	69	63	58	20	20	28
3 Responsibility	56	56	47	69	60	62	43	40	36	12	17	11
Work Environment												
1 Working Conditions	86	85	89	70	64	64	63	60	59	23	25	30
2 Friendly Co-workers	88	91	93	68	65	60	61	61	57	27	30	36
3 Competent Supervision	93	92	94	87	90	79	82	82	75	11	10	19
4 Personal Control	89	88	92	30	29	18	28	26	17	61	62	75
5 Security	95	91	94	86	75	78	83	69	75	13	21	19
6 Leisure	63	57	65	51	42	43	31	26	29	22	31	37
7 Prestige	44	45	41	41	37	36	27	24	22	17	21	19
Compensation												
1 Fair Salary	89	92	89	58	52	44	54	50	42	35	42	47
2 Tech Training	92	92	88	91	91	87	85	86	79	7	6	9
3 Rapid Promotions	56	56	55	39	29	29	27	19	19	29	37	3[illegible]
4 Recognition	74	74	78	57	45	45	46	39	38	28	35	40
5 Travel	28	26	21	68	66	64	23	18	17	5	9	3

Table A4. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Southwest Enlistees (Sample FY 72)**

Job Attribute	High Importance			High Obtainability			Satisfaction			Dissatisfaction		
	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %
Nature of Work												
1 Job Interest	90	89	89	66	59	47	59	54	44	31	34	46
2 Utilization of Talent	85	87	83	73	69	55	65	62	50	20	25	34
3 Responsibility	57	54	39	68	59	45	46	38	23	12	16	16
Work Environment												
1 Working Conditions	85	85	88	71	72	58	62	61	51	22	23	36
2 Friendly Co-workers	90	93	92	67	63	55	62	61	52	21	32	39
3 Competent Supervision	93	90	89	88	85	74	82	77	68	10	13	20
4 Personal Control	86	85	84	31	33	26	28	28	22	58	57	62
5 Security	95	92	89	85	80	74	81	75	68	14	17	21
6 Leisure	52	55	60	54	52	35	30	30	21	22	25	39
7 Prestige	39	43	32	40	37	22	24	23	16	15	20	16
Compensation												
1 Fair Salary	87	91	90	58	57	42	52	53	39	35	38	51
2 Tech Training	93	91	83	91	90	77	86	84	71	7	7	12
3 Rapid Promotions	59	61	53	43	42	26	29	28	15	30	33	39
4 Recognition	73	79	77	55	50	38	45	44	33	28	35	44
5 Travel	28	30	19	64	64	52	22	24	31	6	6	8

Table A5. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Great Lakes Enlistees (Sample FY 72)**

Job Attribute	High Importance			High Obtainability			Satisfaction			Dissatisfaction		
	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %
Nature of Work												
1 Job Interest	89	87	90	58	47	48	52	40	44	37	46	46
2 Utilization of Talent	85	85	87	72	55	58	63	48	53	22	37	34
3 Responsibility	50	45	47	69	50	53	40	30	31	10	15	16
Work Environment												
1 Working Conditions	35	82	89	69	62	62	62	55	57	23	27	31
2 Friendly Co-workers	90	86	87	67	59	52	62	52	47	28	34	40
3 Competent Supervision	92	84	92	86	83	76	81	72	72	11	12	20
4 Personal Control	90	85	87	26	24	19	24	22	18	65	64	69
5 Security	94	91	90	85	79	66	81	74	61	13	18	28
6 Leisure	51	54	57	47	42	40	27	24	24	25	30	32
7 Prestige	36	35	34	40	30	24	21	20	14	15	15	20
Compensation												
1 Fair Salary	88	85	84	55	40	37	52	37	33	37	47	52
2 Tech Training	93	87	84	89	82	84	84	77	72	9	10	12
3 Rapid Promotions	49	45	46	34	31	28	22	14	17	27	31	29
4 Recognition	71	71	78	49	38	41	39	30	36	22	41	43
5 Travel	26	21	21	68	61	61	21	14	15	6	7	5

Table A6. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Far West Enlistees (Sample FY 72)**

Job Attribute	High Importance			High Obtainability			Satisfaction			Dissatisfaction		
	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %
Nature of Work												
1 Job Interest	89	90	88	61	50	40	55	45	34	33	45	53
2 Utilization of Talent	88	86	83	72	62	56	66	53	50	22	33	33
3 Responsibility	53	53	43	67	62	51	41	39	29	12	14	15
Work Environment												
1 Working Conditions	84	85	83	67	56	54	59	50	46	24	35	37
2 Friendly Co-workers	90	88	90	63	47	49	59	42	46	31	45	44
3 Competent Supervision	92	90	90	83	76	71	77	69	66	15	21	23
4 Personal Control	89	85	87	24	23	22	23	19	21	66	66	67
5 Security	93	92	91	87	80	73	82	75	68	11	17	23
6 Leisure	54	59	62	47	47	38	27	32	25	27	27	37
7 Prestige	31	30	27	34	27	23	19	16	12	12	14	15
Compensation												
1 Fair Salary	89	89	87	52	45	36	49	42	32	40	48	55
2 Tech Training	95	91	87	92	88	81	88	81	75	7	9	12
3 Rapid Promotions	50	48	49	37	29	24	22	15	15	28	32	34
4 Recognition	73	71	69	49	42	38	39	34	32	35	38	37
5 Travel	30	25	24	66	61	62	23	20	17	6	5	7

Table A7. **Percentage Distribution of Responses to the I/O Scale by Volunteer Enlistment Category – Midwest/Mtn Enlistees (Sample FY 72)**

Job Attribute	High Importance			High Obtainability			Satisfaction			Dissatisfaction		
	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %	Vol %	Undec %	N-Vol %
Nature of Work												
1 Job Interest	91	86	93	62	52	41	58	45	38	34	41	59
2 Utilization of Talent	86	80	93	73	65	52	65	56	50	21	24	43
3 Responsibility	52	43	45	65	65	52	41	34	27	11	9	18
Work Environment												
1 Working Conditions	83	81	83	70	65	65	61	58	55	22	23	29
2 Friendly Co-workers	91	91	90	63	62	54	59	58	49	33	33	41
3 Competent Supervision	93	94	92	84	83	76	79	79	79	14	14	22
4 Personal Control	87	88	92	23	24	20	20	23	19	67	66	73
5 Security	93	88	92	85	83	74	81	76	68	12	12	24
6 Leisure	52	53	60	49	46	41	28	26	23	24	26	37
7 Prestige	35	3[illegible]	35	34	34	25	20	18	13	16	16	23
Compensation												
1 Fair Salary	88	88	89	52	50	41	48	46	38	40	43	50
2 Tech Training	94	87	86	92	89	81	87	79	72	7	7	14
3 Rapid Promotions	51	[illegible]6	53	38	31	25	24	17	15	27	29	38
4 Recognition	75	77	79	47	44	36	40	37	31	35	40	48
5 Travel	27	20	25	65	61	63	21	14	17	6	6	8

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1976-671-613/35